

## II. INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Edell for his helpful suggestions during an interview held June 8, 2010 at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. The substance of the interview is reiterated below to satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b).

### A. Meeting Attendees:

Name	Function	Attendance
Michael A. Forhan	Attorney for Applicants	In-Person
Joseph F. Edell	Examiner	In-Person

B. Applicants' attorney informally submitted to the examiner proposed amendments and remarks describing applicants' rationale regarding how these amendments and remarks overcome the grounds for rejection.

C. The proposed amendments were reviewed and discussed. The examiner suggested clarifying the language of the limitation relating to the seat cushion and the seatback being pivotable independently of each other to further indicate that the seatback may remain stationary while the seat cushion moves and vice versa.

D. The examiner suggested clarifying the language of the limitation relating to the anchor member to recite an anchor member that stationarily houses the first and second pivot axes for the seat cushion and the seatback respectively, the second pivot axis being spaced apart from and parallel to the first pivot axis, the second pivot axis further being elevated with respect to the first pivot axis.

E. The examiner concurred that the proposed and suggested amendments to the claims overcome the art of record, subject to further search and consideration.

F. The examiner performed a prior art search relating to the proposed and suggested amendments and uncovered U.S. Pat. No. 4,779, 917 to Campbell, et al. The examiner suggested applicants review this reference, submit it formally in an IDS, and ensure that the proposed and suggested amendments distinguish over the reference.

G. Applicants will formally submit the proposed and suggested amendments and the rationale in the form of a reply to the present Office action.